

Remarks

Applicant maintains the traversals of the claims as previously presented, for reasons including the traversals/remarks as presented in the Final Office Action Response (and which were not addressed in the Advisory Action). Applicant therefore fully incorporates the remarks/traversals from the Final Office Action Response herein.

The Final Office Action dated September 19, 2008 lists the following rejection: claims 1-8 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Praria (U.S. Patent No. 4,505,032) in view of Piedmont *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,228,418). Applicant traverses all of the rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

The rejections are improper because the Office Actions of record have failed to assert correspondence to various claim limitations, and because the cited references do not disclose limitations as asserted. For example, the Office Action has not asserted correspondence to limitations in each of the independent claims, including those directed to resistor sub-bodies (exclusively) electrically connected via taps, and the cited references do not disclose such an arrangement of sub-bodies. The cited references also fail to disclose limitations directed to resistor sub-bodies connected via taps that are connected between at most two sub-bodies as in new claim 16. Moreover, the components cited in the references are simply not connected (or even in the same drawing) as asserted in the Office Action.

Applicant has amended claim 1 for readability, and submits that the scope of amended claim 1 is consistent with the claim as previously presented.

Support for the limitations in new claim 16 may be found, for example, in FIG. 1 and its corresponding discussion.

Applicant notes that claims 7 and 8 have been written as independent claims including the limitations of claim 1 from which they formerly depended, and respectfully submits that the alleged “intended use” in the Office Action is no longer applicable. In view of the above and because the cited references fail to disclose the claimed limitations, Applicant believes that the rejections are improper.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.354PA)